



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 18, 2021

Recommendation:	Disapprove
	kevin.guy@sfgov.org
Staff Contact:	Kevin Guy – (628) 652-7325
	San Francisco, CA 94108
Property Owner:	Allison and Todd Davis
	Pacifica, CA 94044
	Rockaway Construction, Inc.
Project Sponsor:	Michelle O' Connor
Block/Lot:	0213/025
	65-A Height and Bulk District
Zoning:	RM-3 (Residential, Mixed – Medium Density) District
Project Address:	1151 Washington Street
Record No.:	2019-005907CUA

Project Description

The Project proposes a rear addition to the existing 3,050 square foot dwelling unit at the basement, first, and second floors, as well as a partially-enclosed roof deck reaching a height of 40 feet, resulting in an approximately 5,200 square foot residence

Required Commission Action

In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must grant a Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 to allow the alteration of an existing residential building in a manner that does not maximize the principally permitted residential density and that would increase the size of an existing dwelling unit greater than 2,000 square feet.

Issues and Other Considerations

- Interim Controls: The Project is subject to the controls of interim legislation (Board File No. 201370, Resolution No. 10-21) which became effective in January 2021, applying to residential projects within RC, RM, and RTO Zoning Districts. The legislation seeks to maximize residential density, and avoid the creation of larger dwelling units that are inherently less affordable. Specifically, the controls require a Conditional Use Authorization for new construction or a substantial alteration of a residential building that does not maximize the principally-permitted density allowed by the Zoning District. Furthermore, a Conditional Use Authorization is required for any project that creates a dwelling unit or expands an existing dwelling unit that is larger than 2,000 square feet. The proposed Project seeks to expand an existing, larger single-family residence in a neighborhood that is characterized primarily by multi-family residential development. The RM-3 District allows up three units per lot, or 1 unit per 400 square feet of lot area. The 3,571 square foot lot could support up to 9 units without taking other code restrictions into account. The neighborhood is walkable and well served by transit, retail shopping, and parks, and is well-suited to the type of higher density residential development prioritized by the interim controls.
- Public Comment & Outreach.
 - **Support/Opposition:** To date, the Department has received no communications with regards to the requested Conditional Use Authorization.

Environmental Review

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as a Class 1 categorical exemption.

Basis for Recommendation

The Department finds that the Project is not, on balance, consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan and does not fulfill the intent of the interim controls. The Project is located within an area primarily characterized by multi-family residential development that is well suited for higher residential density. The size of the existing single-family dwelling is already substantially larger than the 2,000 square foot threshold set by the interim controls, and the Project would significantly expand the unit to over 5,000 square feet. Such larger units are inherently less affordable, and complicate the ability of the property to accommodate additional dwelling units in the future. The Project does not assist in addressing the formidable housing affordability issues that are the subject of the interim controls, as well as many other recent legislative efforts and the State and local level.

Attachments:

Draft Motion for Disapproval – Conditional Use Authorization Exhibit B – Plans and Renderings Exhibit C – Environmental Determination Exhibit D – Maps and Context Photos







PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT MOTION

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 18, 2021

Record No.:	2019-005907CUA
Project Address:	1151 Washington Street
Zoning:	RM-3 (Residential, Mixed – Medium Density) District
	65-A Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	0213/025
Project Sponsor:	Michelle O' Connor
	Rockaway Construction, Inc.
	Pacifica, CA 94044
Property Owner:	Allison and Todd Davis
	San Francisco, CA 94108
Staff Contact:	Kevin Guy – (628) 652-7325
	kevin.guy@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS TO DISAPPROVE A CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTION 303 TO ALLOW THE ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL BUILDING IN A MANNER THAT DOES NOT MAXIMIZE THE PRINCIPALLY PERMITTED RESIDENTIAL DENSITY AND THAT WOULD INCREASE THE SIZE OF AN EXISTING DWELLING UNIT GREATER THAN 2,000 SQUARE FEET, LOCATED AT 1151 WASHINGTON STREET, LOT 025 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 0213, WITHIN THE RM-3 ZONING DISTRICT AND THE 65-A HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On May 12, 2021, Michelle O' Connor of Rockaway Construction, Inc. (hereinafter "Project Sponsor") filed Application No. 2019-005907CUA (hereinafter "Application") with the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Conditional Use Authorization to allow the alteration of an existing residential building in a manner that does not maximize the principally permitted residential density and that would increase the size of an existing dwelling unit greater than 2,000 square feet at 1151 Washington Street, Block 0213, Lot 025 (hereinafter "Project Site").

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as a Class 1 categorical exemption.

On November 18, 2021, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2019-005907CUA.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2019-005907CUA is located at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, California.

The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby disapproves the Conditional Use Authorization as requested in Application No. 2019-005907CUA, based on the following findings:



FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

- 1. The above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.
- 2. **Project Description.** The Project proposes a rear addition to the existing 3,050 square foot dwelling unit at the basement, first, and second floors, as well as a partially-enclosed roof deck reaching a height of 40 feet, resulting in an approximately 5,200 square foot residence
- **3.** Site Description and Present Use. The Project is located on the south side of Washington Street between Taylor and Mason Streets. The Project Site contains an existing three-story single-family residence measuring approximately 3,050 square feet.
- 4. Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood. The Project Site is located within the RM-3 Zoning District on the eastern slope of Nob Hill, to the west of the Chinatown neighborhood. The immediate context is primarily developed with multi-family residential uses measuring three to four stories in height. The subject block also contains larger civic uses, including the Cable Car Barn and Museum and the Betty Ann Ong Recreation Center. Scattered ground-floor commercial uses are located along Mason Street to the east. Other zoning districts in the vicinity of the Project Site include: RC-3 (Residential-Commercial, Medium Density), RH-3 (Residential, House – Three Family), and P (Public).
- 5. Public Outreach and Comments. To date, the Department has received no communications with regards to the requested Conditional Use Authorization.
- 6. Conditional Use Findings. The Project is subject to the controls of interim legislation (Board File No. 201370, Resolution No. 10-21) which became effective in January 2021, applying to residential projects within RC, RM, and RTO Zoning Districts. The legislation seeks to maximize residential density, and avoid the creation of larger dwelling units that are inherently less affordable. Specifically, the controls require a Conditional Use Authorization for new construction or a substantial alteration of a residential building that does not maximize the principally-permitted density allowed by the Zoning District. Furthermore, a Conditional Use Authorization is required for any project that creates a dwelling unit or expands an existing dwelling unit that is larger than 2,000 square feet.

It should be noted that the legislation does not contain unique findings or criteria, but instead relies upon the Conditional Use Authorization criteria in Planning Code Section 303 for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications subject to these interim controls. On balance, the project complies with some, but not all of these criteria, in that:

A. The proposed new uses and building, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

The proposed Project seeks to expand an existing, large single-family residence in a neighborhood that is characterized primarily by multi-family residential development. The neighborhood is walkable and



well-served by transit, retail shopping, and parks, and is well-suited to the type of higher density residential development prioritized by the interim controls. The Project is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and does not address the City's larger affordable housing goals.

- B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:
 - (1) Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

The Project Site is relatively large and can readily accommodate the expansion of the existing building. However, the Project would only serve to expand an existing single-family residence that is already larger than the typical unit found in the vicinity. The RM-3 District allows up three units per lot, or 1 unit per 400 square feet of lot area. The 3,571 square foot lot could support up to 9 units without taking other code restrictions into account. The Project Site could accommodate such a physical expansion while incorporating additional units that would help to address the City's housing affordability issues.

(2) The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

The Planning Code does not require parking for residential uses, and the Project does not expand the parking capacity of the existing building. The Project would not add dwelling units, and would not contribute to additional commuter traffic. However, the Project Site is situated within a walkable context served by abundant transit, with multiple cable car and MUNI bus lines in the vicinity. Such a context is suitable for development containing higher residential density than the large single-family dwelling proposed by the Project.

(3) The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

The proposed Project will not generate noise, glare, dust, or odors.

(4) Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs;

Although the Project proposes to expand the envelope of the building, the Project Site is relatively large and will retain its contribution to the mid-block open space in the area. The Project does not propose any expansion of its existing parking capacity, and does not include loading areas, service areas, or signage.

C. That the use as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of the Planning Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.



While the Project complies with the basic requirements of the Planning Code, it contradicts the intent of the interim controls to maximize residential density and provide for a more equitable distribution of housing unit sizes. The Project also contradicts a number of objectives and policies of the General Plan as detailed below.

D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable Use district.

As stated in Section 209.2, the purpose of the RM Districts is to, "…recognize, protect, conserve, and enhance areas characterized by a mixture of houses and apartment buildings, covering a range of densities and building forms according to the individual district designations…These Districts provide unit sizes and types suitable for a variety of households…" With respect to the RM-3 District, this Section further states that, "These Districts have some smaller structures, but are predominantly devoted to apartment buildings of six, eight, 10 or more units."

The area surrounding the Project Site is primarily characterized by multi-family residential buildings reaching four stories in height. The existing single-family residence on the Project Site is already relatively large compared to the unit mix in the area, and the expansion of this residence would create a unit typology that is atypical for its context. Larger units such as those proposed by the Project are inherently less affordable, and do not contribute to housing opportunities at a range of income levels.

7. General Plan Compliance. The Project is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

Objectives and Policies

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.1

Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.

Policy 1.10

Support new housing projects, especially affordable housing, where households can easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips

OBJECTIVE 3

PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK, ESPECIALLY RENTAL UNITS.

Policy 3.4

Preserve "naturally affordable" housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.



OBJECTIVE 11

SUPPORT AND RESPECT THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS.

POLICY 11.3

Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.

POLICY 11.4

Continue to utilize zoning districts which conform to a generalized residential land use and density plan and the General Plan

POLICY 11.5

Ensure densities in established residential areas promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood character.

OBJECTIVE 12

BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY'S GROWING POPULATION.

POLICY 12.1

Encourage new housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.

The proposed Project seeks to expand an existing, large single-family residence in a neighborhood that is characterized primarily by multi-family residential development. The neighborhood is walkable and wellserved by transit, retail shopping, and parks, and is well-suited to the type of higher density residential development prioritized by the interim controls. The size of the existing single-family dwelling is already substantially larger than the 2,000 square foot threshold set by the interim controls, and the Project would significantly expand the unit to over 5,000 square feet. Such larger units are inherently less affordable, and complicate the ability of the property to accommodate additional, smaller dwelling units in the future. The Project does not assist in addressing the formidable housing affordability issues that are the subject of the interim controls, as well as many other recent legislative efforts and the State and local level.

- 8. Planning Code Section 101.1(b) establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project complies with some, but not all of said policies in that:
 - *A.* That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

The Project Site contains no existing retail uses. The Project would not impact neighborhood-serving retail uses, or opportunities for resident employment or ownership of such businesses.



B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

The area surrounding the Project Site is characterized primarily by multi-family residential development. Large single-family dwellings, such as the unit proposed by the Project, are atypical in the neighborhood and are not reflective of the predominant multi-family residential pattern.

C. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced,

The proposed expansion would create an extremely large dwelling which is unusual for its context, and would create a unit which is inherently less affordable than smaller units.

D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project would not add dwelling units, and would not contribute to additional commuter traffic. However, the Project Site is situated within a walkable context served by abundant transit, with multiple cable car and MUNI bus lines in the vicinity. Such a context is suitable for development containing higher residential density than the large single-family dwelling proposed by the Project.

E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project Site contains no industrial or service sector uses. The Project includes no office uses, and would not impact resident employment or ownership of industrial or service sector businesses.

F. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The expansion of the existing dwelling would be performed in accordance with all seismic safety requirements, and would likely improve the ability of the property to withstand an earthquake.

G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The environmental review performed for the Project concluded that the existing building is not an historic resource. The Project would not negatively impact any historic resources.

H. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The Project Site is situated immediately to the west of an open play area that is part of the Betty Ann Ong Recreation Center. The Project would increase the height of the building, and could therefore cast additional new shadows on the play area during certain times of day. However, the height of the Project is below the 40-foot threshold for the regulations of Planning Code Section 295, which allows the Planning Commission (in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission) to



modify or disapprove taller development which may have an adverse impact on parks and open spaces within the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission.

- **9.** The Project is not consistent with and would not promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would not contribute to the character and stability of the neighborhood and would not constitute a beneficial development.
- **10.** The Commission hereby finds that approval of the Conditional Use Authorization would not promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.



DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **DISAPPROVES Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2019-005907CUA**.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on November 18, 2021.

Jonas P. Ionin Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

RECUSE:

ADOPTED: November 18, 2021





approximate.

C Total co

- D Total Exi

Sheet 9 Sheet 10 Sheet 11

RUCTION TO MEET THE FO	DLL <i>OWING</i>	
<u>CODES AND STANDARDS</u>		
NG, PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL AND MEC NS	CHANICAL	5
Y STANDARDS IND NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS 201 E CALIFORNIA BUILDING AND ENERGY THER LOCAL AND STATE LAWS AND F	CODE	04 February 2021
otes		0 Dru
RE APPROXIMATE AND WILL NEED TO E ILD. WHEN LAYOUT OR DETAIL QUEST ER SHOULD BE CONTACTED.		4 ⊤
IN OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED		ò
CTION V cludes garage and living space ial 27-1		
IDENCE (one dwelling unit)		
<u>Information</u> ion, Inc.		
d #3		1nc. 4 584
Nork		ion, Road 940-2 34.2
vel: Excavate and construct retaining walls t room for storage. Add shear wall and anc		Designed by: Scott Clritmeli Mission Addition, I Addition, I Placific Roberts Phone: 925, 934,2, scintmeli@aol.com
e: Remove existing windows at southern el	evation and existing kitchen	Designed by Scott Clrimely Mission Addi Mission Addi Pacifica, CA phone: 925, 6 scrimeli@ao
7 square foot eat in kitchen per plan. Con Remodel existing master bedroom to crea		Designu Designu Mission 211 Ro Pacífica phone: scirime
create new laundry room. Add new stairwa h west bedroom for master bath. Build neu nd 79 square foot veranda with railings.	iy to new roof top deck. Re-	
e new 710 square foot roof top deck includ e foot conditioned stairwell	ing covered outdoor kitchen per	
<u>vsis</u>		
a of lot: 3,575 square feet plus or minus		/ Notes
covered by structures with roofs: cluding garage)	1,820 square feet	ot
al lot coverage:	1,820 square feet or 23%	<
posed addition:	694 square feet	
al lot coverage after proposed project:	2,514 square feet or 32%	UE
kimum floor area ratio allowed	3,329 square feet	a d
ding garage)		0)
a of existing residence:	2,244 square feet	İİte
a of proposed living space at second floor:	416 square feet	\mathcal{O}
a of proposed living space at third level:	375 square feet	
al conditioned floor area r proposed project:	3,035 square feet	
Calculation:		
ting Gross floor area of basement level:	970 square feet	
ing Gross floor area of 1st Level:	1,040 square feet	
ting Gross floor area of 2nd level:	1,040 square feet	ЬС
Existing Gross floor area:	3,050 square feet	1410
oosed Gross floor area of basement level:	485 square feet	A ST.
osed Gross floor area of 1st Level:	415 square feet	5 RESIDEN Washington Trancisco, C 021 3025
oosed Gross floor area of 2nd level:	415 square feet	511 11115 111115 111111
osed Gross floor area of Roof level:	870 square feet	RE Vasi 21
Gross floor area: (Existing and Proposed)	5,235 square feet	877 27 20
ex	A HOT	DA 115 AP
Site Plan and analysis Existing and Proposed Floor Plans Existing and Proposed Floor Plans Existing and Proposed Floor Plans Proposed Elevations Existing vs. Proposed Elevations Cross Section Detail Color Renderings / Roof Plan Foundation and Framing Plans Roof Erraming Plan Cross section detail	870 square feet	sheet 1 of 11
Roof Framing Plan / Cross section detail Survey	κ. ^C Ο.	



GREEN BUILDING NOTES

Paints and coatings shall comply with V.O.C. limits per CGC4.504.2.2 Aerosol paints and coatings shall meet the Product-weighted MIRlimists for ROC and other requirements per CGC40504.1 Documentation will be provided, at the request of the Building Division, to verify compliance with VOC finish materials per CGC4.504.2.4

Where resilent flooring is installed, at least 80% of the floor area recieving resilent flooring will comply with requirements per CGC40504.4 Hardwood plywood, particleboard and medium density fiberboard composite wood products used on the interior and exterior of the building shall comply with the low formaldehyde emission standards per CGC4.504.4

Building materials with visible signs of water damage shall not be installed. Wall and floor framing shall not be enclosed when framing members exceed 19% moisture content. Moisture content shall be checked prior to finish material being applied per CGC4.505.3







1/4" =1'- 0"









(A)























SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)
1151 WASHINGTON ST		0213025
Case No.		Permit No.
2019-005907ENV		201904198530
Addition/ Alteration	Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)	New Construction

Project description for Planning Department approval.

The project involves a rear horizontal addition and vertical addition to the existing 33-foot-tall, two-story over basement, 3,050-square-foot, single-family residence. The project includes 181 cubic yards of excavation for the proposed basement expansion and a new roof deck that would include a covered outdoor kitchen. The finished building would be 39 feet, 11 inches tall, three stories over basement, and 5,235 square feet in size. The project would require 12 feet of excavation below ground surface.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

The project has been determined to be categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).		
	Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.	
	Class 3 - New Construction. Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.	
	 Class 32 - In-Fill Development. New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below: (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations. (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses. (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species. (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality. (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY 	
	Class	

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

	Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities,	
	hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution</i>	
	Exposure Zone)	
	 Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? Note that a categorical exemption shall not be issued for a project located on the Cortese List if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer). 	
	Transportation: Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?	
	Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? If yes, archeo review is required (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area</i>)	
	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>). If yes, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.	
	Slope = or > 25%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.	
	Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.	
	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.	
Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Don Lewis		
The health department confirmed that the sponsor enrolled in the Maher Program on 10/31/19.		
Planning department staff archeologist cleared the project with no effects on 7/12/19.		
A geotechnical investigation was prepared by Romig Engineers dated September 2019.		

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Property Information Map)		
	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.	
	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.	
	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.	

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check	Check all that apply to the project.		
	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.		
	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.		
	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.		
	4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.		
	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.		
	 Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. 		
	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .		
	8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.		
Note:	Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.		
	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.		
	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.		
	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.		
	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.		

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Chec	Check all that apply to the project.	
	1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.	
	2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.	
	3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.	
	4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.	
	5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.	
	6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.	

	7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.		
	8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):		
	9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):		
	(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)		
	10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Image: Planner/Preservation Image: Reclassify to Category A Image: Reclassify to Category B Image: Reclassify to Category C Image: Reclassify to Category B Image: Reclassify to Category B </th		
	Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.		
	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review . The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.		
Comm	Comments (<i>optional</i>):		
Preser	vation Planner Signature: Maggie Smith		
	STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION		

No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.		
Project Approval Action:	Signature:	
Building Permit	Don Lewis	
If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.	06/24/2020	
Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorica 31of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, a filed within 30 days of the project receiving the approval action. Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Ple	an appeal of an exemption determination can only be	

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:		
	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;	
	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;	
	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?	
	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?	
If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.		

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

	The proposed modification wo	uld not result in any of the above changes.
If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed within 10 days of posting of this determination.		
Planner Name:		Date:

Parcel Map



MASON

N

Sanborn Map*



*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.



Aerial Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Zoning Map



